



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,736	06/27/2003	Richard Postrel	700-148RPC	7683
24002	7590	03/25/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTHONY R BARKUME 20 GATEWAY LANE MANORVILLE, NY 11949			MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3623

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/608,736	POSTREL, RICHARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Susanna M. Diaz	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 30-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 30-58 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 30-58 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 33, 34, 42, 43, 51, and 52 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 33, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Claim 34, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Claim 42, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Claim 43, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Claim 51, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Claim 52, line 2, insert --be-- after "may"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 30-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "the designated reward points" in lines 19-20.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination

purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 39 recites the limitation “the designated reward points” in line 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 48 recites the limitation “the designated reward points” in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 48 appears to be intended as a system claim; however, there are no system elements expressly recited in the body of the claim. A system requires at least two elements. Therefore, the means recited in the preamble is not sufficient to form a system. If Applicant asserts that the means recited in the preamble is an element of the system, such assertion will raise questions regarding whether or not claim 48 is a single means claim. Additionally, the body of the claim should make clear which elements of the system are carrying out each recited function.

Claim 56 recites the limitation “the designated reward points” in lines 15-16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 57 recites the limitation “the designated reward points” in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 58 recites the limitation “the designated reward points” in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, “the designated reward points” will be interpreted as “the selected reward points.”

Claim 58 appears to be intended as a system claim; however, there are no system elements expressly recited in the body of the claim. A system requires at least two elements. Therefore, the means recited in the preamble is not sufficient to form a system. If Applicant asserts that the means recited in the preamble is an element of the system, such assertion will raise questions regarding whether or not claim 58 is a single means claim. Additionally, the body of the claim should make clear which elements of the system are carrying out each recited function.

Claims 31-38, 40-47, and 49-55 are dependent from claims 30, 39, and 48, respectively, and therefore inherit the same rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 30-33, 36-42, and 45-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MyPoints™ Program, as disclosed in the following references:

Information about the MyPoints™ Program retrieved on July 26, 2002 from Internet <URL:<http://web.archive.org/web/19980128231040/http://www.mypoints.com>>, herein referred to as MyPoints™ Program web site. This web site was archived by web.archive.org on January 28, 1998.

Oberndorf, "Points for Loyalty," published December 1997.

Riedman, "MyPoints Aims to Be Universal Web Currency," published August 18, 1997.

MyPoints™ discloses a method for making an online purchase over a networked computer system comprising the steps of:

[Claim 30] (a) a user accessing a web site for logging into an online reward points trading system that allows accumulation of reward points from a plurality of individual reward accounts for application towards online payment of a product, each individual reward account associated with an individual reward issuing entity (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 1 – Points are collected from different sources, on and off the Internet, and combined into one universal account; Pages 7-8 – Each web site decides how many points to offer to a user. Points may be provided either on- or off-line and are processed overnight to be posted to the universal account on the following day in order to avoid fraudulent activity. This means that the points issued by the participant sites must be tracked at least long enough, e.g., in a user reward account, to transfer this earned reward points information to the user's universal account on the MyPoints™ server, i.e., the trading server; "Points for Loyalty": ¶ 6 – Issuing catalogers, i.e., reward

points issuing entities, purchase points from MyPoints; therefore, they must maintain a balance of purchased points in order to account for how many reward points they possess to offer to users and to reconcile those already rewarded. This is especially important in order to reconcile points granted for off-line activities);

(b) the reward points trading system determining over the network the number of reward points a user has in each of a plurality of individual reward accounts (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 1 – Points are collected from different sources, on and off the Internet, and combined into one universal account; Pages 7-8 – Each web site decides how many points to offer to a user. Points may be provided either on- or off-line and are processed overnight to be posted to the universal account on the following day in order to avoid fraudulent activity. This means that the points issued by the participant sites must be tracked at least long enough, e.g., in a user reward account, to transfer this earned reward points information to the user's universal account on the MyPoints™ server, i.e., the trading server; "Points for Loyalty": ¶ 6 – Issuing catalogers, i.e., reward points issuing entities, purchase points from MyPoints; therefore, they must maintain a balance of purchased points in order to account for how many reward points they possess to offer to users and to reconcile those already rewarded. This is especially important in order to reconcile points granted for off-line activities);

(c) the user selecting via the web site a product to be purchased from a plurality of available products (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 8 – Points can be redeemed both on- and off-line for merchandise, travel, and services);

(e) the user interactively selecting via the web site points from selected individual reward accounts to be accumulated and applied to the purchase of the selected product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 8 – Points can be redeemed both on- and off-line for merchandise, travel, and services. By selecting a product for which to redeem points, the user is essentially selecting at least one account, albeit only one account, from which points are to be redeemed);

(f) the reward points trading system accumulating the designated reward points from the selected individual reward accounts for application in a purchase transaction for the selected product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 8 – Points can be redeemed both on- and off-line for merchandise, travel, and services; “Points for Loyalty”: ¶ 6); and

(g) the reward points trading system executing a purchase transaction for the selected product on behalf of the user by applying the accumulated points to the purchase price of the product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 8 – Points can be redeemed both on- and off-line for merchandise, travel, and services; “Points for Loyalty”: ¶ 6);

[Claim 31] wherein the step of the user selecting via the web site a product to be purchased from a plurality of available products comprises the steps of:

a. the reward points trading system generating an online catalog of a plurality of products available for purchase (MyPoints™ Program web site: Pages 17, 19-21 – Reward issuing entities include airlines and hotel chains);

b. the reward points trading system providing the online catalog for display to the user via the web site (MyPoints™ Program web site: Pages 17, 19-21 – Reward issuing entities include airlines and hotel chains); and

c. the user selecting a desired product from the online catalog displayed via the web site (MyPoints™ Program web site: Pages 17, 19-21 – Reward issuing entities include airlines and hotel chains);

[Claim 32] wherein an available product is displayed in the online catalog along with the number of reward points required to purchase the product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Pages 17, 19-21 – Reward issuing entities include airlines and hotel chains);

[Claim 33] wherein an available product is displayed in the online catalog along with the number of reward points that may be applied to purchase the product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Pages 17, 19-21 – Reward issuing entities include airlines and hotel chains);

[Claim 36] wherein the step of the user selecting via the web site a product to be purchased from a plurality of available products comprises the steps of:

a. the reward points trading system providing links to associated merchant web sites that display products available for purchase (Oberndorf: ¶ 4);

b. the user linking the user computer to an associated merchant web site (Oberndorf: ¶¶ 4, 8);

c. the user selecting a desired product from a merchant web site (Oberndorf: ¶¶ 4, 8);

[Claim 37] further comprising the step of the reward points trading system causing the selected individual reward accounts to deduct the reward points designated by the user and accumulated by the reward points trading system for the purchase transaction for the selected product (MyPoints™ Program web site: Page 8);

[Claim 38] wherein consideration is provided to the reward points trading system by a reward issuing entity in exchange for the deduction of reward points designated by the user from an associated reward account ("Points for Loyalty": ¶ 6 – The cost of the points purchased from MyPoints™ by the issuers, i.e., the reward issuing entities, is \$0.016 per point while the redeemers only receive \$0.01 per point from MyPoints™; therefore, MyPoints™ makes a commission of \$0.006 per point).

Regarding claim 1, MyPoints™ provides a user with his/her point balance; however, MyPoints™ does not expressly teach a web site displaying to the user the number of reward points available for redemption in at least one of the plurality of individual reward accounts. The user can redeem points by purchasing products online. Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art to display important account data to a user on a web site. This facilitates quick and easy access to data that a user might need during an Internet transaction; therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to implement with MyPoints™ a web site displaying to the user the number of reward points available for redemption in at least one of the plurality of

individual reward accounts so that the user can quickly and easily assess whether or not he/she has enough points to redeem for a desired product.

[Claims 39-42, 45-58] Claims 39-42 and 45-58 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 30-33 and 36-38 above; therefore, the same rejection applies. Please note that MyPoints™ is an Internet-based system and therefore comprises various servers and computers.

7. Claims 34, 35, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the MyPoints™ Program, as disclosed in the following references:

Information about the MyPoints™ Program retrieved on July 26, 2002 from Internet <URL:<http://web.archive.org/web/19980128231040/http://www.mypoints.com>>, herein referred to as MyPoints™ Program web site. This web site was archived by web.archive.org on January 28, 1998.

Oberndorf, "Points for Loyalty," published December 1997.

Riedman, "MyPoints Aims to Be Universal Web Currency," published August 18, 1997, and as applied respectively to claims 33 and 42 above, *in view of* Biorge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,045).

Regarding claims 34, 35, 43, and 44, MyPoints™ provides for the exchange of points for merchandise, travel, or financial services ("Points for Loyalty": ¶ 5) and even cash ("MyPoints Aims to Be Universal Web Currency": ¶ 7), yet it does not explicitly

state that the purchase may be accomplished with a combination of points and additional payment, such as through a credit card transaction; however, Biorge discloses an incentive program in which incentive credits are redeemed for discounts for a given transaction (col. 7, lines 14-29). This means that the user must provide a combination of incentive credits, i.e., points, in addition to the monetary balance of the transaction amount, i.e., other consideration, in order to complete the transaction. Like MyPoints™, Biorge provides an incentive program to its users, but Biorge also facilitates the added flexibility of allowing a user to exchange his/her incentive credits/points for a discount towards a transaction as opposed to a user having to wait until he/she accumulates enough points to pay for an item in full. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to adapt MyPoints™ to enable users to redeem their points in combination with other consideration provided by the user (as taught by Biorge) in order to facilitate the added flexibility of allowing a user to exchange his/her incentive credits/points for a discount towards a transaction as opposed to a user having to wait until he/she accumulates enough points to pay for an item in full. For example, a user might want to use his/her balance of points towards vacation expenses (e.g., airfare, hotel, cruises, etc.); however, it would inconvenience the user to have to delay his/her trip until the adequate number of points to pay for the entire travel item is earned. By allowing the user to make up the monetary difference of his/her point balance and the exchange value of the travel item, the user has greater flexibility in utilizing his/her points (as evidenced by Biorge's incentive program), thereby encouraging further patronage from the user.

Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art to pay off a split transaction balance with a credit card. Credit cards facilitate quick payment for online transactions, such as those taught by MyPoints™; therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to allow a user of MyPoints™ to pay a transaction balance (e.g., if the user does not have enough points for a desired product) in order to facilitate quick payment for an immediately desired purchase (i.e., without having to wait until the user accumulates enough points).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 30-55 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the claim objections and rejections under Double Patenting and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action, AND amended to clarify that the user ***actively selects a subset of points from two or more individual reward accounts at the time of redemption***. As they currently stand, claims 30-55 read on a user having access to all of his/her reward accounts (e.g., accessing different web sites corresponding to different loyalty programs through the same terminal) and then selecting one account from which to redeem points.

9. If amended accordingly, claims 30-55 would be deemed allowable for the following reasons.

The following references have been identified by the Examiner as the closest prior art of record:

(1) MyPoints™ Program, as disclosed in the following references:

(a) Information about the MyPoints™ Program retrieved on July 26, 2002 from Internet

<URL:<http://web.archive.org/web/19980128231040/http://www.mypoints.com>>, herein referred to as MyPoints™ Program web site. This web site was archived by web.archive.org on January 28, 1998.

(b) Oberndorf, "Points for Loyalty," published December 1997.

(c) Riedman, "MyPoints Aims to Be Universal Web Currency," published August 18, 1997.

(2) Biorge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,045).

(3) Schlumberger Payflex card, as disclosed in the following references:

(a) "World's First Smart Card Frequent Flyer Scheme Debuts," published September 19, 1997.

(b) "Major Airlines Continue Their Smart Card Fly-bys," published January 1998.

(c) "Schlumberger: AOM's Smart Card Frequent Flyer Program Successfully Launched," published May 22, 1998.

(4) Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,599).

Similar to the claimed invention, the MyPoints™ Program is a reward points accumulation and redemption program. Also, the MyPoints™ Program allows a user to gather points from different reward points issuing entities. Then all gathered points are accumulated in a universal account from which points may be redeemed through a trading server. However, unlike the claimed invention, MyPoints™'s users do not have control over which of a subset of reward points are accumulated in the universal account; all MyPoints™'s reward points are accumulated in the universal account regardless of which reward points issuing entity issued the reward points. Biorge discloses an incentive program in which incentive credits are redeemed for discounts for a given transaction (col. 7, lines 14-29). The Schlumberger Payflex card is a smart card that stores user loyalty information for multiple retailers ("World's First Smart Card Frequent Flyer Scheme Debuts": ¶ 1). Loyalty points are accumulated on these smart cards; these points can be exchanged for free airline tickets, instant flight upgrades, car rentals, taxis, hotels, restaurants, entertainment, etc. ("World's First Smart Card Frequent Flyer Scheme Debuts": ¶ 2). Walker teaches the concept of "providing and managing a customized reward offer to an affinity group sponsor based on the aggregate performance of members of the group" (Abstract).

However, neither the MyPoints™ Program nor any of the other aforementioned references teaches or suggests the novel aspects of the claimed invention which allow a user to maintain a plurality of individual reward accounts and then selectively choose how many of a subset of reward points and from which two or more individual reward

accounts are to be applied toward purchase of a selected product via a reward points trading system.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 30-58 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-76 of copending Application No. 10/648,705. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 30-58 of the instant application are directed toward accumulating selected points from various individual reward accounts to be applied toward the purchase of a product selected online while claims 30-76 of Application No. 10/648,705 are directed toward accumulating selected points from various individual reward accounts to be applied toward the purchase of an item won during an auction. Both auctions and purchasing products online are well-known forms of obtaining items that are to be paid for by a buyer. Furthermore, it is old

and well-known that many auctions are conducted online, with payment being made online as well; therefore, the Examiner asserts that, in light of the claimed invention in Application No. 10/648,705, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to accumulate selected points from various individual reward accounts to be applied toward the purchase of any product selected online (be it from an auction or other product source) in order to encourage use of the claimed rewards program by expanding the user's redemption options.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

12. Claims 30-58 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,640. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 30-58 of the instant application are fully anticipated by the language of claims 1-47 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,640.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Please note that all references marked with an asterisk on the attached PTO Form 892 are not being provided to Applicant since Applicant was already supplied with a copy of each marked reference in parent Applicant No. 09/602,222.

Blagg (US 2003/0182218) -- Discloses the ability to pool reward points held in various related accounts (¶¶ 175-184).

Helbig (US 2002/0116257) -- Discloses an online incentive program.

Anderson et al. (WO 01/01278 A2) -- Discloses a server-based system for monitoring points across various loyalty programs and allowing a user to redeem and convert points.

"Transmedia Europe, Inc. and Transmedia Asia Pacific, Inc. Announce the Acquisition of a Silicon Valley Internet Loyalty and Member Benefit Provider" -- Discloses Award Track, Inc.'s server-based system for monitoring points across various loyalty programs and allowing a user to redeem and convert points.

Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,660) -- Discloses an incentive program customized to each retailer's needs.

Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,778) -- Discloses an incentive program in which rewards are granted based on a product's success.

Fredregill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,016) -- Discloses an in-store points redemption program.

Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,736) -- Discloses an incentive program that credits a monetary award to a customer's retirement account.

Messner (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,514 B1) -- Discloses a method for marketing and redeeming vouchers for use in online purchases.

Paltinghe et al. (EP 0 917 120 A2) -- Discloses a virtual wallet system in which a smart card can be a proxy to a wallet server where currency is stored.

"Chip Cards Get a Loyal Corporate Following" – Discloses a smart card loyalty points program.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (703) 305-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

or faxed to:

(703)305-7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703)746-7048 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, 7th floor receptionist.

Susanna Diaz
Susanna M. Diaz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623
March 19, 2004